

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in the above application. By the above amendment, claims 19-22 have been added.

The Office Action dated February 23, 2007, has been received and carefully reviewed. In that Office Action, claim 14 was objected to for being indefinite, claims 1, 3-11, 14, 15 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Winston, and claims 2, 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Winston in view of Mochizuki. Each of these issues is addressed below, and reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-22 is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

CLAIM OBJECTION

By the above amendment, claim 14 has been revised to address the objection raised in the Office Action.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Winston. In rejecting claim 1, the Office Action appears to be interpreting the surface of element 20 that is in contact with element 31 as the "surface on which the light is incident." By the above amendment, claim 1 has been revised to more clearly require a first light guide layer having first and second ends where light is incident on the first end and wherein reflection means are provided on the second end. Winston does not show or suggest the structure now claimed in amended claim 1, and claim 1 is submitted to be allowable over Winston for at least this reason.

Claims 2-20 depend from claim 1 and are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 2, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Winston in view of Mochizuki. Claims 2, 12 and 13 depend from claim 1. Mochizuki does not address the shortcomings of Winston discussed above in connection with amended claim 1.

Claims 2, 12 and 13 are therefore submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Winston in view of Van Hees. Claims 16 and 17 depend from claim 1. Van Hees does not address the shortcomings of Winston discussed above in connection with claim 1. Claims 16 and 17 are therefore submitted to be allowable over the art of record for at least the reasons provided above in connection with claim 1.

NEW CLAIMS

Claims 19-22 are also submitted to be allowable over the art of record. Claim 19 defines a light guide plate wherein first and second sides of a first light guide layer are parallel. This is not shown or suggested by Winston. Claim 20 recites a reflection means on a second end of a first light guide layer that is obliquely angled with respect to a first surface of the first light guide layer which is also not shown in Winston. Claim 21 recites a light guide plate that includes a first light guide layer having first and second ends, where the first end includes a first surface through which light from a light source enters the first light guide layer, and the second end includes a second, reflecting, surface obliquely angled with respect to said first surface. A scattering light guide layer is stacked on a first side of the first light guide layer first side for emitting light as scattered light and includes a second light guide layer having a refractive index less than the refractive index of the first light guide layer and also including a scattering layer. The first light guide layer causes total reflection of light at the second, reflecting, surface and at a second side. This structure is also not shown or suggested by the art of record, and claim 21 is therefore submitted to be allowable over the art of record.

CONCLUSION

Each issue raised in the Office Action dated February 23, 2007, has been addressed, and it is believed that claims 1-22 are in condition for allowance. Wherefore, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-22 is earnestly solicited.

Application No. 10/539,239
Amendment dated May 17, 2007
Reply to Office Action of February 23, 2007

Docket No.: 1248-0789PUS1

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the examiner is respectfully requested to contact Scott Wakeman (Reg. No. 37,750) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: May 17, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By  #37,750
for Michael R. Cammarata

Registration No.: 39,491
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant